



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

pressed by Professor Greenough, in the preface to his edition of Horace's Satires and Epistles, that "college students sufficiently advanced to undertake Horace, ought no longer to get and recite lessons, but to study the literature, and understand and enjoy it". If I remember correctly, a reviewer said that the College student ought to have learned how to get lessons. To me getting lessons and reciting them (by action, if in no other way) seems one ever-recurring business of life. This is why I have never been able to accept wholly, it at all, some recent declarations that in the early stages of Latin study the pupil should not be allowed, much less required, to attack any new work at home. A charge repeatedly brought against current American education is that it fails to help the student to develop initiative. I fail to see how initiative can be developed by a pupil who attacks, in his most impressionable years, only the things that have been worked out fully for him, so that in essence he merely repeats, and develops nothing ab initio, and has no chance to learn from those most effective means of learning, one's mistakes. All this is strictly germane, though it may not seem so, to Dr. Radin's paper. I watched with the utmost interest the High School and College work, in Latin and Greek, of a boy not in any way by inclination a Classicist. He had access, in his own home, to an excellent collection of Greek and Latin books, including the easily accessible books of reference. As I watched him, I realized, as never before, how helpless are the pupils who have at hand but the single edition of Caesar or Cicero or Vergil, etc., supplied to them by the High School. I learned then, if never before, that one reason, a very important reason, for the meagerness of our pupils' knowledge of Latin and of Roman things lies in the fact that books on Latin matters are to them largely inaccessible, especially in those hours in which they study at home. To offset those opportunities of learning a modern foreign language which come to the pupil from the chance to talk in that language with others, in everyday life, in a real way, about real things of real life, and from the chance to use newspapers in those languages, to travel in the countries where those languages are used, etc., the pupil of Latin needs plenty of books—the books that as a rule he never sees.

With the concrete criticisms of High School texts in Latin made by Dr. Radin I could easily bring myself to agree in large part; if I again perpetrate such a text I will (and shall) keep his paper ever by my side as I work out the book. With the expression of one conviction, of many years' standing, I close. The number of pupils in School and College who are willing to read Introductions and Commentaries is large; the number who really read them is also far from small. If such parts of editions, whether meant for School or for College, are really helpful, if they give the things that the

student needs, and put those things in the proper way, they never lack readers, even if voluminous.

I trust it will not seem ungracious if I say that I should like to see Dr. Radin produce a book on the lines laid down in his paper. Addresses to classical teachers frequently stop at the very point where they should begin. When I hear a burning exhortation to teach the Classics as literature, to make them stand always in vital relation to life, I find it hard not to cry out *maxima voce*, 'Show me the way in these matters. Have I not fancied all these years that I myself have taught the Classics as literature, and that I have made them stand in vital relation to life?' I cannot believe that, in reacting thus to such addresses, I am unique—a circumstance which may account in large measure for the real or apparent ineffectiveness of appeals to be born again out of trespasses and sin, and the real or apparent futility of discourses about method. Appeals and discourses are alike too general; they should be made far more specific, far more concrete—unless, indeed, we are prepared to admit that methods are after all incommunicable, and that the power e.g. to teach the Classics as literature cannot be transmitted by exhibitions of concrete ways in which it has been done.

C. K.

#### HIGH SCHOOL TEXTS IN LATIN<sup>1</sup>

It is quite settled that with the educational revolution which is sweeping down upon us, Latin will be abolished, wiped out, made to be as though it were not. Our vocationalistic brethren have seen the Mene Tekel very plainly indeed. And if classical scholars do not in general feel the joints of their loins loosed and their knees smiting one against another, it is because that gentry is notoriously blind.

To be sure, there is, perhaps, still a chance for us. It may be that the prophecy of ruin and desolation is conditioned as was that other prophecy familiar to High School students—*totius urbis atque imperi interitum appropinquare nisi di immortales omni ratione placati suo numine prope fata ipsa flexissent*. Haply we may yet succeed in placating the immortal gods.

Indeed, unless they are very unreasonable, these immortal gods, they ought to be to no slight extent already placated. A great deal of activity has been directed to the improvement of methods of instruction, and to the enrichment of the substance of instruction in Latin and Greek, and we may indulge ourselves in the fond hope that these efforts have not been in vain. In spite of all the symposia at which Latin is solemnly dirged out of the educational universe, it still remains a fact that much more Latin is taught and that it is much better taught than it was a generation ago, and a gener-

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Seventh Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Baltimore, May 2, 1913.

ation of men is not a long time—as we all know from Aristophanes.

Since these things are so, the following strictures upon certain ingrained habits will not, I trust, be taken as an additional fling of asses's hoofs at a decrepit lion, but simply as an attempt at currying slightly a very live lion possessing a most majestic roar.

It has always been the custom to make part of the instruction in most languages, particularly in Latin and Greek, consist of the intensive study of certain so-called 'texts'. These texts are, of course, actual books written at a certain time for vastly other purposes than to serve as school-exercises. By the careful analysis of these texts it is hoped to give the student a command of the words used, a knowledge of the life depicted, and the secondary moral effects of a rigid discipline in grammar. In Latin and Greek the first two purposes were somewhat more prominent a hundred years ago, when larger amounts were read. But from time to time the quantity required to be mastered has become less and less. Honest men could consent to such a reduction of the task imposed on them only by demanding a closer and more exact study of what was left—and that involved an increase of the grammatical discipline.

It is doubtless true that the existence of discipline and the efficacy of grammar to provide it are still controversial matters, but then there are so few educational subjects that are not controversial matters. At any rate, both are assumed for the present, since it is every one's inalienable right to set the conditions of his problem.

The grammatical training consists of two parts. (1) The pupil is required to prepare for himself at home the translation of a selected portion of Latin. To do this he must determine the grammatical relations of all the words from their inflections and from such collocations as his experience has taught him to recognize. (2) He must classify most of the mode and case relations according to a set scheme: e.g. he must distinguish between the means, cause or manner uses of the ablative, between infinitives complementary or substantive, etc. All this requires a certain nicety of observation and a certain revolving of ideas that cannot fail to produce a healthy mental activity. In our present standardized course, the text-books in Latin contain four books of Caesar's Gallic War in the second year, six orations of Cicero in the third year, and six books of Vergil's Aeneid in the fourth year. Many of these text-books are available, each published by a different firm and edited by some well-known scholar.

As far as the editor is concerned, there can be no question that, if scholarship and experience are tests, he is in nearly every instance admirably, and some-

times eminently, fitted for his task. What faults there are in existing books are due to wrong traditions and not, in appreciable degree, to deficiencies of individual editors. It may further be said that the illustrations that follow will be drawn wholly from editions of Caesar and Cicero. Many of the points urged do not apply at all to editions of Vergil. However, the fundamental criticisms are meant quite generally and apply to editions of Vergil as well as to those of Homer and Xenophon.

An edition of Cicero happens to lie before me, very recently issued and prepared by highly trained and practical scholars. It contains just the six required orations. The book has 358 pages. Of these the introduction takes 43 pages; 110 pages are given to the actual Latin text, from which there must be deducted about 9 pages of explanatory matter in English in the body of the text; the notes occupy 95 pages; 109 pages form a vocabulary or special lexicon for this edition. That is to say, less than 28% of the book is devoted to what the pupil is actually to read, and 72% consists of means to help him read it.

There is no need to pile up statistics. The proportion indicated is maintained for most school editions. In twelve books examined the amount of space given to the text constituted but 20 to 30% of the whole book.

In the forty-three pages of introduction in the particular edition referred to above we find a sketch of Cicero's life, an account of Roman government, some brief remarks on the topography of the forum and a still briefer notice of oratory in Cicero's time. With some slight variations, these are the usual contents of introductions in editions of Cicero and, *mutatis mutandis*, of the other school authors.

If the editors of these books were asked to prepare treatises on the matters referred to, to wit, Roman history, Latin literature, constitutional law, development of oratory, Roman religion or military tactics, they would very properly decline to assume tasks for which they could make no adequate preparation. As a matter of fact there are few subjects in any field of research that are quite so full of debatable questions as just these, which are the necessary and inevitable contents of these 'introductions'.

Now, judged as information, this matter must above all be accurate. Is the average editor of High School text-books in a position to guarantee its accuracy as the result of his own researches? It is no reflection upon him to say that he is not, that he has not the leisure to undertake the special researches that would be necessitated. He will accordingly select and summarize from various manuals and reference-books. How thoroughly he does this will depend upon the importance he attaches to Introductions.

Unfortunately it is only rarely that the matter seems to be considered of capital importance. In the back of the editor's head is the well-grounded conviction that the pupil rarely, if ever, reads the Introduction, and that, when he does, it is under compulsion as a lesson to be gotten, and that he will do no more with it than memorize such individual facts as may be asked of him in recitation or written examination. The consequence is that Introductions are prepared with a hasty eclecticism that makes errors almost inevitable, and these errors are by no means always trivial. If, however, we waive that point, it does not appear that any possible gain can accrue from sending pupils to such very inadequate essays. If it is important that the pupil shall get this information—and it is of the highest importance—, why can he not do the very thing that the editor did, i.e. consult the easily accessible books of reference and so train his judgment in selecting and his power of expression in reproducing the facts he will find there?

As far as the text itself is concerned, little can be said. If it is clearly printed and without typographical errors, it meets all reasonable requirements.

It is in the Notes that we may expect to find the chief personal contribution of the editor, the fruits of his scholarship and experience. Just what are 'Notes'? We may use English works as illustrations. Notes are necessary, not only for authors in a foreign language, but also for English authors studied in schools. Nearly always, the English writer studied possessed a range of knowledge and a command of words considerably beyond that of most of the readers for whom the book was originally designed—altogether beyond, therefore, that of High School students. For the latter, accordingly, the various references to literature, history, and mythology must be explained and the unusual words must be defined. Generally, that is done briefly and accurately.

Why does the Latin student need more? Because, we are told, the text is so difficult that, without hints about the relation of the various words and suggestions about the rendering of many phrases, he will be unable to understand even the individual sentences, much less appreciate the book as a whole. If it is objected that texts of such difficulty should not be given to students till they can handle them, the retort is ready that there are no others.

Then the question presents itself: What help shall be given? A balance must be struck between the *nimum* and the *parum*. Not so much should be given as to pauperize the pupil's intellect, not so little as to cripple his endeavors and overwhelm him with the sense of helplessness. How does the editor solve this problem?

In matters of substance, his duty is nowise dif-

ferent from that of the editor of such books as Comus, The Ancient Mariner, etc. All references to persons, places, incidents and institutions that may be assumed to be unfamiliar must be explained. However, the editor's real and special business lies in the assistance he wishes to give the students in the translation of the Latin. As a type of how this is done, I shall again refer to the book mentioned before, and turn to the very beginning of it—the first two chapters of Cicero's Oration on the Manilian Law.

In the first place, the body of the text contains brief English summaries before each section, enough to acquaint a pupil with the general sense. Then, in the Notes, the two pages of Latin text have two pages of explanatory comments. These may be classified as follows:

(1) Translations, as follows: *frequens conspectus*, 'crowded assembly'; *amplissimus*, 'most dignified'; *ornatissimus*, 'most honorable'; *cuique*, 'all, every'; *rationes*, 'plans', 'scheme'; *ineunte aetate*, 'the beginning of my mature years'; *cum*, 'since'; *huius auctoritatem loci*, 'this place of influence'; *temporibus*, 'requirements'; *praetor primus*, 'praetor first chosen'; *auctoritatis*, 'influence'; *ad agendum*, 'to direct public measures'; *forensi usu*, 'practice in the courts'; *potissimum*, 'most of all'; *fructum*, 'a wider activity'; *singulari*, 'unrivalled'; *virtute*, 'merits'; *ducitur*, 'originates'; *vectigalibus*, 'tributaries'; *relictus*, 'left unconquered'; *laccessitus*, 'exasperated'; *pro necessitudine*, 'in view of the close relation'; *genus est eius belli*, 'the war is of such nature'; *agitur*, 'is at stake'; *requiretis*, 'you will seek in vain'. That is to say, about *twenty-five* words or phrases are translated outright for the student. Of these, *fourteen* are translated in the Vocabulary, exactly as they appear in the Notes, and *four* are translated there by common synonyms of the words used in the Notes. There remain about six translations for which any justification whatever can be made out. In the case of one of these, *fructum*, the translation offered is misleading, if not quite wrong.

(2) We find certain grammatical points explained: "*qui . . . defenderent*: relative clause of characteristic" (with full references to grammars); "*Mihi*: dative of agent with the gerundive"; "*qui . . . successerit*: . . . subjunctive because it is a dependent clause in indirect discourse. *Huic* is dative after it"; "*quibus amissis*: ablative absolute expressing condition"; "*a vobis*: used instead of the dative because the verb *consulere* governs the dative" (full grammatical references).

Of these six all but the last are syntactical constructions so common in occurrence that the ordinary student may fairly be charged with knowledge of them. Indeed, it is in recognizing just such constructions that the grammatical discipline spoken of above is to be gained.

Notes of this character are in no sense the peculiar property of this edition. They are typical. In other editions, fewer phrases, perhaps, are translated, and many more grammatical references are given, but the principle remains the same. The main difficulty lies in the fact that the Notes violate every purpose for which they are ostensibly inserted. If it is deemed advisable to make careful selection of English words part of the training in Latin, surely the pupil receives no training when, as shown above, the list from which he is to select is put in a Vocabulary and the selection is then carefully made for him in the Notes. Again, if recognition of grammatical categories is a useful drill, there is no good reason for relieving the pupil from that task.

And, finally, are these really the difficulties which a pupil reading Cicero is likely to meet? My own experience has been that in that first fine period of the Pompeian speech, a pupil is much more likely to be worried about the construction of the first clause with its postpositive *autem* in the second member than about adequate English renderings for *ornatissimus* and *amplissimus*. Surely, far more than translation of individual phrases the pupil needs, reiterated and continually re-applied, a general method of attacking such a sentence. He needs exercise, not crutches.

Most editions of Caesar naturally have vastly more complete grammatical references. Some go so far as to indicate in this way every instance of case syntax, even such recondite constructions as means or indirect object. It must be at once apparent that what ought to be a stimulating form of mental exertion becomes in this way a repetition of memorized facts, and that such a repetition no more assists the development of the pupil's mind than would the use of a printed translation. These Notes are, in fact, a grammatical 'pony'.

It is difficult to speak with moderation of the Vocabularies. First and above all, the existence of these vocabularies never had any real justification. Their preparation was always a *consilium deterius*, a concession to sloth. It is, to be sure, unconscionable to send a boy fresh from one year of Latin to such a book as Harpers' Dictionary and bid him pick out a suitable meaning from two or three columns of fine print. But I venture to think that he would have less real difficulty with the huge quarto, when certain mechanical details are made clear, than with the special vocabulary so carefully put together for him. In Harpers', he would, in the first place, find the various renderings unmistakably classified and only a very few English words in each class. What is the situation of a pupil who looks up *fero* in a 'Vocabulary'? He finds such things as the following: "*fero*: bear, carry, bring; tolerate, suffer, endure, meet; report,

make known, say, tell; bring forward, propose; obtain, receive; with *se*, betake one's self; *sententiam ferre*, vote". The meanings are, to be sure, grouped by semicolons, but no one will pretend that, for High School students, that is an adequate means of ordering this chaos. Many pupils are as likely as not to go away with the conviction that *fero* means 'meet' or 'say' in such sentences as He met his friend, or He says he will come. And all pupils will contemplate this list with a distinct sinking of the heart and shrinking of the flesh.

As a matter of fact, not only this list but all such lists are fundamentally incorrect. It is simply not true that *fero* has or can have half the meanings here collected. The most that can be said is that in certain very special associations and often only in a limited number of forms a Latin phrase containing *fero* may conceivably be rendered by an English phrase containing 'meet' or 'say'. But that is not the same thing as assigning that meaning to *fero*, and it is easier to explain that fact to a class than to distress an honest student with so many words for the same thing.

However, it is not in the least necessary to send an elementary pupil to a complete or fairly complete lexicon. All that is needed is one sufficiently large to include all the words he will be likely to meet in all his reading and sufficiently concise to render its use practicable for him. And such lexicons exist.

But if we are irrevocably committed to the special vocabulary, are we also pledged to turn each one of them into a miniature English thesaurus? The example of Professor Lodge's Vocabulary of High School Latin may be profitably pondered. In one edition of Cicero, seventeen English words are given for *facio*. Professor Lodge has the following: "*facio* . . . do, make, in many senses and phrases".

It will be urged that for the extension of the pupils' command of English it is helpful to present for each Latin word various approximately synonymous English words. If that be so, at least let that purpose be clearly manifest and let these synonyms be grouped together and clearly differentiated by appropriate typographical devices. For my own part, I feel very strongly that this presentation should come from the teacher in the class-room, and that when Professor Lodge's vocabulary gives for such a chameleon as *ago*, the following, "*drive, carry on, do, act*; then fig., *treat, discuss*. Of time, *spend*", it has really given the pupil more than a special vocabulary which, like the one before me, registers no less than thirty different renderings. These do not even begin to exhaust all possibilities, but they are quite numerous enough to make the choice of one of them a heartbreaking matter for the student.

It savors of arrogance to set forth what a school

edition should contain. However, it is perhaps easier to invite the reproach of arrogance than that of purposeless destructive criticism. An edition which I feel sure many teachers would welcome would be one that contained in its introduction, (1) a bibliography both copious and practical, (2) a certain number of facts absolutely essential to understand the author or the book, honestly given as facts to be memorized. It would contain essays on the life and genius of Cicero and on the government of Rome, when and if the editor has a contribution of his own to make to these topics.

The Notes would avoid anything that the Vocabulary can as well provide. They might simplify long periods by Latin paraphrases. They might render Latin idioms by several suggestive English ones. Perhaps they would in such cases confine themselves to giving the force of the passage and leaving it to the teacher to supply English versions. Grammatical assistance would be confined to rare usages or to niceties which the pupil cannot be expected to recognize readily.

If there is to be a Vocabulary, each word need have only the simplest and most general meanings attached to it. It is presumed that the school library possesses a copy of Roget's Thesaurus.

The suggestion has been made that there are Latin teachers who might be embarrassed by the meagerness of such an edition. I hesitate to believe it, but, if there are, the remedy is simple. Let them purchase, each one of them, a 'Handy Literal', and gallop securely on it from pay-day to pay-day.

MAX RADIN.

NEWTOWN HIGH SCHOOL, Elmhurst, New York City.

### REVIEWS

Greek Imperialism. By William Scott Ferguson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company (1913). Pp. 258. \$2.00 net.

Historians of the old schools generally considered that the history of Greece ended with the death of Alexander the Great. It is only within the last fifteen years that the three centuries with which the Pre-Christian era closes have come into their own. Mr. Ferguson's brilliant researches in the documents of Hellenistic Athens have not only restored order out of chaos, making the connected study of that period possible, but have also contributed most to the later history of 'shining Athens'. In his Lowell Lectures, which he has now published under the title of Greek Imperialism, he maintains the thesis that the age of Pericles was but the youthful bloom of the science of government. The vigorous maturity came in the days of Macedonian supremacy.

To the Macedonian age we owe much. In many ways it is surprisingly like our own. The Balkan States were then making and unmaking alliances with as much hearty unconcern and as little justifi-

cation as in our own day. The struggle for supremacy by sea was constantly going on. Dreadnoughts and super-dreadnoughts were being built, and some of the kings were up-to-date enough to have part of their navy on paper.

In spite of the fact that all the world was an armed camp, science, philosophy and education were developing as never before. In the world of thought it was essentially an age of criticism. The old religions had been weighed in the balance and found wanting. New gods were being imported constantly from the East and placed for a time in the councils of Olympus. These eastern importations were not merely made to satisfy their craving for some new thing to replace the older outgrown polytheism, but were also due to a "failure of nerve", as Gilbert Murray puts it. Interesting support for Professor Murray's phrase is found in the frequent use of the pejorative *-ikos* suffix found so frequently in the writings of the speculative philosophers of the later age.

In the science of government the city state and its hegemonies had failed in the test of imperialism to which Athens, Sparta and Thebes had come in turn. Students of political science were busying themselves with constructing ideal states, failing, however, to read the lessons of the past or wilfully disregarding them, and utterly overlooking the possibilities of future growth and development. Into the chaos of petty quarrels and disputes of the financially impoverished and politically bankrupt city states came the dominant power of Macedon. It remained for Alexander the Great to cut the Gordian knot of reconciling his kingship over the old city states by securing apotheosis for himself. Since he was rated as a god, those peoples which had the spirit of democracy bred in every fiber of their being could yield him an obedience which could never be given to king or tyrant. Mr. Ferguson has already stated this hypothesis elsewhere but he has elaborated it in greater detail in this book. While one may hesitate to accept the theory without reserve, it is very difficult to formulate any definite objection to it. In Asia and in Egypt there was of course no opposition, for the divinity of the ruler was unquestioned. Any other basis for kingship would have been unsafe as well as undesirable. It was the importation of the idea into Europe which was the achievement of Alexander. Perhaps the readiness with which the Greek world accepted the idea in the third century was due to the influx of oriental religions, and more particularly astrology, after the conquest of Asia. It was a common doctrine of the East that monarchs were destined to astral immortality (Cumont, *Astrology and Religion*, 179), and the spread of this belief in Greece reconciled the Greek cities to the divinity of the kings in a way that would have been impossible if the old religion were still strong in the hearts of the people.